

REMARKS

Claims 1 and 5-12 are pending in this application. By this Amendment, claim 1 is amended to further distinguish from the cited references. Support for the amendments to claim 1 can be found in the original specification at, for example, page 10, lines 8-19 and Fig. 4. No new matter is added.

In view of the foregoing amendments and the following remarks, reconsideration and allowance of claims 1 and 5-12 are respectfully requested.

35 U.S.C. §103(a) Rejections

Claims 1, 5 And 12

Claims 1, 5 and 12 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as allegedly having been obvious over Saito (JP 2003-222992) in view of Guinane (U.S. Patent No. 2,738,564). Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection.

Amended claim 1 requires (1) lower support parts that are disposed in four corners of the bottom lid, upper support parts that are disposed in four corners of the top lid, (2) each of the lower support parts and each of the upper support parts including a pair of support portions having an L-shape, (3) each of the pair of the support portions in each of the lower support parts and in each of the upper support parts including an oblique face being in contact with a corner edge of the substrate and (4) the substrate being clamped from a lower side and from an upper side, between the support portions of the lower support parts and the support portions of the upper support parts, so that vertical and horizontal movement of the substrate is substantially prevented.

These features of claim 1 provide the benefits that when the top lid is closed, the edges in the four corners of each of the top and bottom faces of the substrate are positioned at both the oblique faces in the support portions of the upper support parts and the oblique faces in the support portions of the lower support parts in the four corners. Thus, the substrate is

securedly clamped between the bottom lid and the top lid, and is prevented from moving in both the vertical and horizontal directions at the same time. Accordingly, the substrate is protected during shipping from contamination due to dust generation and vibration. See page 10, lines 9-19 of the specification.

The Patent Office alleges that Saito describes all of the features of prior claim 1 except (1) lower support parts that are disposed in four corners of the bottom lid, each of the lower support parts being brought in contact with a pair of edges of the substrate on a bottom face side thereof, (2) each of the lower support parts and each of the upper support parts includes a pair of support portions having an L-shape in contact with the pair of edges of the substrate, and (3) each of the pair of support portions in each of the lower support parts and in each of the upper support parts including an oblique face being in contact with a corner edge of the substrate. Saito also does not describe feature (4) of claim 1 above (the substrate being clamped from a lower side and from an upper side, between the support portions of the lower support parts and the support portions of the upper support parts, so that vertical and horizontal movement of the substrate is substantially prevented). The Patent Office alleges that Guinane remedies the deficiencies of Saito. However, for at least the following reasons, the combination of Saito and Guinane would not have rendered obvious at least features (1)-(4) above of amended claim 1.

Guinane does not remedy the deficiencies of Saito. Guinane describes that a tile 12 to be treated rests on respective ledges 9 of the base part 6. However, the ledges 9 upon which the tile rests are horizontal (not oblique). In other words, a horizontal portion of the bottom of a tile 12 rests upon a horizontal portion of the ledges 9. Further, Guinane does not show any upper portion of the base part 6 being in contact with the tile 12. A markup of Fig. 3 of Guinane is below for reference in comparison to Fig. 4 of the present application. Thus, Guinane does not describe, or provide any reason or rationale for one of ordinary skill in the

art to have come to, each of the pair of support portions in each of the lower support parts and in each of the upper support parts including an oblique face being in contact with a corner edge of the substrate.




Fig. 3 of Guinane




Fig. 4 of Present Application

Thus, Guinane does not remedy the deficiencies of Saito regarding features (1)-(4) above, and the combination of Saito and Guinane would not have rendered obvious claim 1.

Claims 5 and 12 depend from claim 1. For at least their respective dependency, and for the additional features recited, the combination of Saito and Guinane also would not have rendered obvious claims 5 and 12.

In view of the above, withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested.

Other Rejections

The following claims were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as allegedly being obvious:

(i) claims 6 and 7 over Saito in view of Guinane and further in view of Kosugi (U.S. Patent No. 4,776,462);

(ii) claim 8 over Saito in view of Guinane and further in view of Scherb (U.S. Patent No, 5,259,523);

(iii) claim 9 over Saito in view of Guinane and further in view of Scherb and even further in view of Yamauchi (U.S. Patent No. 5,353,934);

(iv) claim 10 over Saito in view of Guinane and further in view of Freed (U.S. Patent No. 3,615,006); and

(v) claim 11 over Saito in view of Guinane, further in view of Freed and even further in view of Yamauchi.

Applicant respectfully traverses each of these rejections.

None of Kosugi, Scherb, Freed and Yamauchi describe, or provide any reason or rationale for one of ordinary skill in the art to have come to, the above features (1)-(4) of claim 1. Thus, none of Kosugi, Scherb, Freed and Yamauchi remedy the deficiencies of Saito and Guinane described above with regard to claim 1. None of these references, alone or in combination, render obvious claim 1.

Each of claims 6, 7 and 9-11 depend from claim 1. For at least their respective dependency, and for the additional features recited, no combination of the cited references would have rendered obvious claims 6, 7 and 9-11.

In view of the above, withdrawal of the rejections is respectfully requested.

Concluding Remarks

In view of the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that this application is in condition for allowance. Favorable reconsideration and prompt allowance of claims 1 and 5-12 are earnestly solicited.

Should the Examiner believe that anything further would be desirable in order to place this application in even better condition for allowance, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned at the telephone number set forth below.

Respectfully submitted,



James A. Oliff
Registration No. 27,075

Andrew B. Whitehead
Registration No. 61,989

JAO:ABW/abw

Date: October 26, 2009

OLIFF & BERRIDGE, PLC
P.O. Box 320850
Alexandria, Virginia 22320-4850
Telephone: (703) 836-6400

DEPOSIT ACCOUNT USE AUTHORIZATION Please grant any extension necessary for entry; Charge any fee due to our Deposit Account No. 15-0461
--